Conclusion

Because preservation "was a given" in the 1998 Annapolis Comprehensive Plan, preservation planners and the community can continue to use existing tools, such as the studies mentioned above as well as the Historic Preservation Commission's general authority to order studies and surveys and designate landmarks, until 2004 when preservation will become part the 2004 comprehensive plan, according Jon Arason, director of the Department of Planning and Zoning. Planners and preservationists agree that a separate preservation plan would raise awareness and provide a framework for future projects that involve historic resources.

Notes

1 Anthony Lindauer, *From Paths to Plats: The Development of Annapolis, 1651 to 1718* (Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Archives and Maryland Historical Trust, 1997), p. 10.

2 John Reps, *Tidewater Towns* (Williamsburg, Va.: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972), p. 127. Edward Papenfuse, Maryland State Archivist, demonstrates that archeological evidence suggests that was the beginning of a grand baroque scheme in St. Mary's City, in his monograph, "Doing Good to Posterity": *The Move of the Capital of Maryland From St. Mary's City to Ann Arundell Towne, Now called Annapolis* (Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Archives and the Maryland Historical Trust, 1995), pp. 5-7.

3 Ann Jensen, "The History and Evolution of Preservation in Annapolis," *Historic Preservation Forum* 13 (Fall 1998): 30-36.

4 The Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection, and Planning Act of 1992 did not require a preservation element although historic and archaeological sites can be included under the required Sensitive Areas element. Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 66B, Section 3.05.

5 City of Annapolis, Annapolis Comprehensive Plan (Annapolis, 1998), prepared by Wallace Roberts Todd, pp. 90-91.

Donna Hole is the Chief of Historic Preservation, Department of Planning and Zoning, City of Annapolis. She can be reached at <dch@ci.annapolis.md.us>. The city's website is <www.ci.annapolis.md.us> .

Joseph E. Brent

Community Consensus Planning for Battlefield Preservation

This essay deals with preservation planning for Civil War battlefields and sites; however, these techniques will work for other types of historic preservation projects as well. All of the projects with which this author has been associated developed, ultimately, out of a partnership between a non-profit entity and a government agency. Although these preservation efforts may not have begun as a partnership, they ended up that way.

The point to this essay is that the preservation planning process in and of itself is a catalyst for the preservation of a given site. By making the effort to go through the process, a preservation group takes a huge step forward to insure the site's preservation. The successful process is led by either a local non-profit or a local government agency to insure that it will be successful. The impetus needs to be local and include an element of community consensus building. Successful battlefield preservation efforts are achieved through community consensus-based planning and strong local leadership. There is, of course, no magic formula, but the process draws upon the support of the general public and that of local governments. Efforts using community consensus-based planning have been highly successful.

A successful process for preserving a Civil War site involves three components: nominating the property for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, creating a preservation and management plan, and developing an interpretive program. The order in which these components are completed is not critical but a successful project achieves all three. Exactly how planning projects progress is dependent upon the initiator of the effort, but the process that each site goes

Community meeting at Lillington, North Carolina, for the Averasboro preservation and management plan.

through is similar. It is extremely helpful if the local leader has a mentor throughout the process. This mentor can be a consultant, National Park Service staff, or state historic preservation office staff, but it should be someone who has experience working with community consensus-based planning and can help guide the effort toward the logical goal of stable long-term preservation.

The process itself is perhaps the most important aspect of community consensus-based preservation planning. When a local non-profit takes the step to initiate some concrete preservation activity, be it a National Register nomination or a preservation plan, it opens the project up beyond the confines of the group. More people become involved, creating an opportunity for partnership building. This can be especially helpful with the local government and landowners. With either a National Register nomination or a preservation plan, the local government will become involved. If the county has some form of planning and zoning both types of projects will draw the attention of the planning and zoning board. The board will at the very least become aware that a historic resource exists and may recognize its significance by placing a zoning overlay district on it. Landowners also become involved, as it is their land that contains the historic resource. A well-done plan or National Register nomination will calm fears of undue government interference with the landowner's rights. Most landowners know their property has historic value and take pride in that. The process is an opportunity to get them actively involved in the preservation of the resource.

Community consensus-based planning is the ultimate opportunity for partnership building. It is important to seize this opportunity and make the most of it. Special invitations should be extended to local officials, representatives of the tourism industry, chamber of commerce, historical societies, and any other local entities that can aid the cause. They should be told they are welcome and encouraged to participate in the planning meetings. These officials should be acknowledged at the meetings and thanked for coming. Representatives from the state historic preservation office should be invited to meetings as well. Including someone from the state capital will add a broader recognition of the importance of the project.

The community meetings create non-confrontational opportunities to share information in a public forum about what needs to be done at the Civil War site. Most public meetings are designed to receive formal testimony on controversial policies, school redistricting, tax increases, and so on. Community meetings, on the other hand, are designed to encourage attendees to learn about the issues, exchange ideas, and become a part of a positive process.

Benefits from going through this process are many. Funders and local, state, and federal agencies take a project seriously if it has been through a public process. Often to get funding a Civil War site must be listed in the National Register. In addition, having a preservation and interpretive plan demonstrates that the preservation group has done its homework; it knows what it is doing and that it is serious about making the process work. The plan tells funders, including local government, exactly how their money will be spent.

The process brings the battlefield preservation effort into focus. It will help the non-profit by giving it concrete goals to follow although leadership may change. A written preservation plan will help local government officials and others understand what the preservation group is trying to do. This alone will enhance the preservation efforts because the plans and goals are now concrete. By nominating the Civil War site for listing in the National Register, the preservation group has identified exactly where the boundaries of the historic resource are and why the resource is important. The interpretive plan will begin to tell the story of the historic site for the general

public. It is easier to excite an informed public. However, this article is not about the nuts and bolts of preservation and management plans, but the process and its results. Next we will look at some specific examples in Kentucky to see how community consensus planning has helped local non-profits and governments move Civil War preservation projects forward and create mechanisms for protecting the land.

The Kentucky Model

In 1991, the Kentucky Heritage Council (KHC) was not paying a lot of attention to Civil War sites preservation. The site identification section staff (the staff concerned with survey and the National Register) was focused on vernacular architecture. The KHC had recently added a rural preservation and easement staff person but the Civil War was not a priority.

In 1991, however, with training and modest funding from the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) of the National Park Service, the KHC began the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Survey. A temporary staff person was assigned the task of completing the survey and working with the ABPP. This survey moved the Heritage Council into new ground, it brought new partners to the KHC, and it made the Civil War a priority.

Between 1993 and the present, eight preservation and management plans have been created within the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Plans have been completed for the sites at Perryville, Mill Springs, Munfordville, Camp Wildcat, Fort Duffield and Fort Boone (the Leslie W. Morris Park), Camp Nelson, and Columbus-Belmont State Park. Mill Springs and Middle Creek battlefields were designated as national historic landmarks and Richmond, Munfordville, Sacramento and Tebbs Bend battlefields and Fort Sands and Fort Duffield were listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Fort Boone in Frankfort after the initial clearing of trees and underbrush.

The planning process has led directly to the preservation of some 1,200 acres of land and the creation of three new battlefield parks and interpretation at five others. It increased the size of the state park at Perryville from about 100 acres to over 400 acres. At Mill Springs the land protected grew from one acre to 100 acres.

The Camp Wildcat battlefield was partially protected in that the USDA Forest Service owned part of it, but much of the core area was in private hands. The non-profit Camp Wildcat Preservation Foundation was founded in 1993 to try to purchase the critical 200 acres that was in private hands. The effort at Wildcat demonstrates how planning and partnership building can work.

The non-profit was already working with the Forest Service, but the community consensus-based planning process brought the two groups closer together. As a result of the preservation plan the Forest Service became involved in the interpretation of the site, by funding and creating the first brochure. The Forest Service and the Laurel County Fiscal Court were invaluable in the final preservation of the land. Both entities were involved in the application for ISTEA Enhancement funds to purchase land and to implement an interpretive program, with the county as the sponsor and the Forest Service as an in-kind partner. Today the land is actually owned by Laurel County. The county has a memorandum of agreement with the non-profit to run the Camp Wildcat Park project and the Kentucky Heritage Council holds easements on the land purchased with ISTEA funds. A second ISTEA award allowed for the interpretation of the battlefield. The Forest Service provided the technical support to create the trails and waysides that will be constructed on both county-owned and Forest Service land.

The Wildcat project is a study in partnerships. Federal, state and the local governments played important roles in the preservation of this battlefield. This coalition was created during the planning process. A private benefactor put up the money to hold a critical piece of property until the ISTEA funds became available and, of course,

the Camp Wildcat Preservation Foundation coordinated the entire project. The end result is that some 500 acres, including Forest Service land, is now being preserved and interpreted as a Civil War battlefield park. This is a significant victory for preservation, and easements and National Register status insure that the land will be protected.

Two city parks, one in the state capital, Frankfort, a city of about 30,000, and the other in West Point, just west of Louisville, with a population of about 500, demonstrate how planning can move government from apathy to action. In the early 1990s, both Fort Duffield and Fort Boone (the Leslie W. Morris Park) were overgrown, the forts barely visible through thickets of brush, trees, and vines; their condition the result of years of neglect.

Fort Duffield's planning effort began as the result of an inquiry by the West Point Merchants Association. The Association was trying to bring tourism into West Point. They realized that they had a Civil War fort and wanted to capitalize on it. The fort had been donated to the city in the 1970s by Fort Knox Military Reservation. Since the mid-1970s, the park had been largely forgotten by the city and allowed to become overgrown.

The West Point Merchants Association secured a grant from the Kentucky Heritage Council and began a community consensus-based planning process. The plan was completed in early 1994 and volunteers began to clear the growth from the fort and grounds. Once the vegetation was cleared, well-preserved earthworks 10 to 15 feet high were visible. ISTEA funding was secured by the City of West Point to improve access to the fort, to erect interpretive signs, and to build a wooden walkway to protect the earthworks.

During the planning process a second nonprofit, Friends of Fort Duffield, was founded. These volunteers took over the effort begun by the Merchants Association and it is they who now run the park. The plan called for the fort's nomination to the National Register. KHC staff provided this service for the City of West Point and the fort was listed. The Friends created a self-guided walking tour, built restrooms, and obtained headstones for the adjacent cemetery. Fort Duffield went from an overgrown hillside to a well-maintained park in less than five years; in fact, almost all of the goals laid out in their plan were accomplished in that time.

Jim Cass, president of Camp Wildcat Preservation Foundation, presents Allan Howeller with an award of appreciation for his efforts in helping preserve the Wildcat Mountain battlefield.

None of this would have happened without the stimulus of the community consensus-based planning process. There simply would have been no Fort Duffield Park, or at least not as it exists today. There was some interest, but no direction. The KHC was able to provide technical assistance in the form of a National Register nomination and also a copy of the National Park Service's *Earthworks Management Manual* to the people who wanted to begin clearing the fort. This kept them from using a bulldozer to do the work and gave the proper guidance to get the job done in a way that did not adversely affect the resource. The plan document gave them a blueprint for what needed to be done. Today, as a result of the foundation that was laid in the early 1990s, the stewards of Fort Duffield have a tradition of working with the state historic preservation office and following prescribed methods for work at the site.

The story in Frankfort is very similar. The Civil War forts are located on land that is atop a hill in the heart of downtown Frankfort. The Union army built the forts to defend the city and they command the old downtown. In the 1970s, the Commonwealth of Kentucky constructed a road to the top of the hill to provide access to the forts. Plans had been made to create a state park, complete with a lodge, on top of the hill. Visitors would be afforded a view of the City of Frankfort and the Kentucky River. Fortunately this vision never came to fruition, but the road remained. In 1983, a reenactment was held at the forts and

this action nearly scuttled the current effort before it ever began. Thousands of spectators who could not get to the top of the hill in their cars parked their vehicles on the adjacent residential street, and walked to the top. They trampled lawns, blocked cars and generally irritated the people of the neighborhood.

For 12 long years, nothing happened on Fort Hill. In 1995, Historic Frankfort, Inc., a local preservation non-profit, obtained funding from the KHC to prepare a preservation and management plan for the park. Prior to the open community meeting, a meeting was held with the neighborhood committee. The residents of the neighborhood had very good memories, and photographs of what had happened during the reenactment. They did not want it to happen again. They were, and are, opposed to having the old state road opened to traffic, especially to tourists.

This small but vocal group forced the plan to exclude the old state road as an access option. The city, the planners, Historic Frankfort, Inc., and the newly formed Friends of Fort Hill agreed to abandon plans to use the road for vehicles and other options were explored. Eventually two separate means of access were developed. The old military road was to be used for pedestrian traffic and an alternate route used for vehicles. Because of the opposition, the community meetings in Frankfort were by far the most contentious of any held in Kentucky in the 1990s; yet the plan was completed and accepted by the city.

In June 1999, a two-day event officially opened the Leslie W. Morris Park. There was a living history event, food, and a large crowd of people on hand. The city had spent the spring clearing the underbrush from the forts and developing a rudimentary tour of the historic area. Since then an interpretive building has been built on the site and the interpretation is being upgraded.

The City of Frankfort, which had been indifferent at best to the park, has now embraced it as an important part of the city's tourism package. The city went so far as to enlarge the National Register boundary for the park. The Leslie W. Morris Park has become an asset for Frankfort. The change in the attitude of the city can be directly attributed to the planning process. As a result of his active involvement in the process, the city manager, who had been unaware of the importance of protecting battlefields, attended a battlefield preservation conference, and returned to Frankfort a major supporter of the Fort Hill project.

While it is true that both Fort Duffield and the Leslie W. Morris Park are city property and, therefore, in theory protected, they were in danger of destruction by neglect. The planning process brought the parks back into the spotlight and allowed city government and/or the friends group to preserve and interpret the earthworks and open them to the public. In essence, through planning, the people got their heritage back.

Conclusion

The community consensus-based planning process in Kentucky has heightened awareness of Civil War battlefields and sites across the Commonwealth. While it would not be accurate to say that this has led to dramatic changes in planning and zoning policies in Kentucky, community planning has helped preserve land. At Camp Nelson plans are underway to place a historic preservation overlay zone on the Camp Nelson National Register district (some 600 acres of farmland) and any changes at the Leslie W. Morris Park in Frankfort are monitored by the historic preservation board of that city. Once the updated national historic landmark boundary is finalized in Perryville, it too, or at least a portion of it, may fall under the review of the historic preservation board of that city.

Simply going through the planning process helps, not only the people trying to preserve the site, but the whole community. In the parlance of our times, the planning process helps move a site to the next level of commitment. It brings new people on board, it creates new partnerships and it helps preserve the land that is, after all, why we are doing this in the first place.

Joseph E. Brent served as the Civil War Sites Preservation Coordinator for the Kentucky Heritage Council, the state historic preservation office, from 1990 until 1999. He left state service to form a public history consulting firm with Maria Campbell Brent. He is now vice-president of Mudpuppy & Waterdog, Inc. in Versailles, Kentucky.

Photos by the author.